

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

B5

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED]
LIN-07-167-50391

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **AUG 02 2010**

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. On June 2, 2010, this office provided the petitioner with notice of adverse information in the record and afforded the petitioner an opportunity to provide evidence that might overcome this information. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a transportation company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a senior computer engineer pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). As required by statute, an ETA Form 9089 Application for Permanent Employment Certification (ETA Form 9089) approved by the Department of Labor (DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to submit documentary evidence to establish the beneficiary's requisite experience for the proffered position, and failed to establish that a bona fide opportunity exists for the beneficiary. Therefore, the director denied the petition.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. See *Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). On June 2, 2010, this office notified the petitioner that according to the records at the Illinois Secretary of State official website, the petitioner has been involuntarily in the State of Illinois. See <http://www.ilsos.gov/corporatellc/CorporateLlcController> (accessed on May 26, 2010).

This office also notified the petitioner that if it is currently dissolved, this is material to whether the job offer, as outlined on the immigrant petition filed by this organization, is a *bona fide* job offer. Moreover, any such concealment of the true status of the organization by the petitioner seriously compromises the credibility of the remaining evidence in the record. See *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 586 (BIA 1988) (stating that doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition.) It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. See *Id.*

This office allowed the petitioner 30 days in which to provide evidence that the records maintained by the Illinois Secretary of State were not accurate and that the petitioner remains in operation as a viable business or was in operation during the pendency of the petition and appeal. The notice sent to the petitioner has been returned by the United States Postal Services due to "not deliverable as addressed unable to forward." However, more than 30 days have passed and counsel for the petitioner has failed to respond to this office's request for a certificate of good standing or other proof that the petitioner remains in operation as a viable business or was in operation from the priority date onwards. Thus, the appeal will be dismissed as abandoned.¹

¹ Additionally, as noted in the notice of derogatory information, even if the appeal could be otherwise sustained, the petition's approval would be subject to automatic revocation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 205.1(a)(iii)(D) which sets forth that an approval is subject to automatic revocation without notice upon termination of the employer's business in an employment-based preference case.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed as moot.